



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,213	04/04/2005	Andre Schenk	1123.44662X00	2877
20457	7590	01/25/2008	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP			VO, TED T	
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1800			2191	
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/530,213 Examiner Ted T. Vo	SCHENK, ANDRE Art Unit 2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 4/4/05 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/4/05, 12/14/05, 1/9/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the specification and Preliminary Amendment filed on 04/04/2005.

Restriction and Election requirement would be applied if the claims are not filed in a single invention. Claims 1-29 are pending in the application.

Specification

2. The specification of the present application is objected to.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(I) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 7-9, 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7-9, 15-29 act like dependent claims, but the scopes of the claims are not within the scopes of the independent claims. The dependencies of the claims are improper.

Claims 7-8, 15-24 are indefinite because using the term "computer readable medium" that is unclear for the types of medium. It should be noted that air, transmission media, radiation, etc., are also media. These media are capable of storing code. The code stored in these media can be executable by a computing device. These media are non-statutory under 35 USC 101. Without defining, the type of the medium in the specification will render the claims 7-8, 15-24 indefinite. The interpretation for "computer readable medium" in the Claims 7-8, 15-24, is "air".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. The claims 7-8, 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 because the claimed invention directs to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 7-8, 15-24 include computer readable medium where the medium is cover non-statutory claimed subject matter such as air, wireless transmission, etc. The claims are non-statutory under 35 USC 101 because they include subject matters of abstract idea.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steven Kim (hereinafter: Kim), "Java Web Start", in view of John Zukowski (hereinafter: Zukowski), "Deploying Software with JNLP and Java Web Start".

As per Claims 1: Kim discloses a development and distributing a Java Application for a platform/client ('a *multi-level database*'). The Java Application is integrated in an XML file (i.e. 'XML configuration file') (See "An example of JNLP file") and then distributed to the platform. At the platform, when receives the XML file that integrated with the Java application, it parses the XML and extract the code to provide the Java application installed in the platform. The distribution of the Java application carried by the XML file discloses,

Regarding: ***Method for generating distributed applications for each level in a multi-level database environment, comprising:***

-receiving an integrated configuration code (interpreted as: Java web start: JNLP file) ***comprising code sections for all information*** (See "An example of JNLP file" having information of Jar files) ***required for generating an application in each of said levels*** (The Jar files are part of a distributed Java Application)

(Kim: See p. 8, "The core of Java Web Start: JNLP", and see "The JNLP is an XML file": i.e. the limitation reads on the Java Web Start, that received at the platform (interpreted as "*each level in a multi-level database*" since Sun Systems and IBM are dealt with all levels of multi-level database)

For this limitation:

- parsing all code sections in said integrated configuration code () required for at least one level of said multi-level environment - extracting said parsed code sections for said at least one level, and
Kim discloses, for receiving a Java Web Start first time, code is parsed and extract such as seen in "installing Java Web Start for the first time" (p. 2). After Java Web Start installed, it allows the client using the Java Web Start to extract visioning Jar Files (p. 9-10). Java Web Start is parsed and displayed in WEB (i.e. HTML/XML files that are readable by a web browser) for Java Applications.

Regarding:

- converting said extracted code sections into level-specific application code for each extracted level (Kim discloses the code section in the JNLP contains JAR files and versions (p. 8). The browser

allows the XML attributes and tags parsed for displaying in the Web Browser, where the code sections is displayed for allowing the client to converting or installing the Java Application into a level-specific application (See p. 8, "The purpose of the JNLP file is as follows:" and its five bold bullets).

Kim discloses the JNLP file as an "integrated configuration XML file" for distributing Java applications (Kim: Figure 8), but does not explicitly mention the ***distributed applications for each level in a multi-level database.***

Zukowski shows J2EE that is a multi-tier environment (See p. 1, "Java 2 Platform", See p.3, the last lines of the page), where J2EE includes multi-tiers database. A JNLP file is developed **for generating distributed applications** for this J2EE environment.

It is obvious to the ordinary in the art at the time of filing to include ***generating distributed applications for each level in a multi-level database***, such as in J2EE environment. Using the Java Web Start with XML for distributing Java Applications allows the client at all platforms can retrieve the Java applications at a specific level of tiers, where a ***multi-level database***, does not make patentable different upon any specific database.

As per Claims 2: Kim discloses, ***Method according to claim 1, wherein said parsing step comprises identifying all code sections in said integrated configuration code required for at least one level of said multilevel environment.*** (See the Kim Browser, or Figure 8)

As per Claims 3: Kim discloses, ***Method according to claim 1, wherein said level-specific application code is a JAVA code*** (Refer the Jar files).

As per Claims 4: Regarding, ***Method according to claim 1, further comprising sending said level-specific application code to a device in said multi ,level database environment*** (Refer the JNLP files developed for J2EE as seen in Zukowski)

As per Claims 5: Regarding,

Method for generating an integrated configuration code in a multi-level database environment, comprising:

- receiving at least one representation of a database table of said database,***
- retrieving all meta-information of said database table represented by said least one representation from said database, said meta-information comprising information related to the contents of and additional information, about said at least one database table,***
- generating an integrated configuration code comprising code sections for all meta information retrieved from said database.***

See the rational given in Claim 1, where meta-information is the information specified within tags and attributes of the XML File (JNLP file), Database table is as such XML schema or DTD (Zukowski: shown in "Packaging"), and J2EE is a multi-level database environment.

As per Claims 6: Kim discloses, ***Method according to claim 1, wherein said integrated configuration code is an XML file*** (JNLP file is an XML file).

As per Claims 11-14: The rejection of the claims is the same as the rejection of Claim 6. See the rationale in the claim 6.

As per Claims 7-9, 15-29: The rejection of the claims is the same as the rejection of Claim 1. See the rationale in the claim 1.

As per Claim 10: The rejection of the claim is the same as the rejection of Claim 1. See the rationale in the claim 1.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3706. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708.

The facsimile number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is the Central Facsimile number **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TTV
January 18, 2008

Ted Vo
TED VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER